mistake which "J. F." delineates. We *had* an architecture which was at once the offspring of our race, our climate, and our religion; but we were enticed from it by an exotic style, unsuited to any of them. This we have, for three centuries, been vainly endeavouring to render our own, and every step has but plunged us deeper in the mire of inconsistency. During this long course of striving after classicism, or, in other words, after the adaptation of the architecture of another race, a different climate, and an adverse religion, it has been the fashion to cry down as barbarous that one style which had been the gradual production of the Teutonic race, as influenced by the climate of northern Europe and the Christian religion, simply because it differed in its details and its expression from the architecture of ancient Greece and Rome.

Recently, however, a change has come over us, and that not the result of any decided movement, nor of any "teaching," whether true or false, but a spontaneous and unconscious change. We have at once become restlessly dissatisfied with our "classic" wanderings, and have opened our eyes to the beauties and surpassing claims of the style which was relinquished for them. This feeling is too deep, too intense to be checked: it *must* continue and prevail; so that the object is to guide, not to stem it. Every well-directed effort to do the one will be rewarded and gratefully responded to; every attempt to do the other will end in failure and contempt. Our position is this:—Unlike any other people at any other period, we have no style which is at once our own and perfectly wrought up to the requirements of our day, and this simply arising from our having once left the right track. The experience of every age and people tells us that no style of architecture has ever been deliberately invented; all which have existed have been the spontaneous and gradual growth of circumstances. What then are we to do? Our attempts at Anglicizing Roman, or Greek, or Italian, have been but sickly failures, and, to say the least, are as much open to the charges of copyism and inconsistency as any other course. Are we to go eastward and import the styles of Egypt or of Hindoostan; or westward, for those of Central America or Peru? We cannot bring a whole nation to join in inventing a new style; and if they did it would take centuries to perfect it. All we want is to give a correct and reasonable key-note, by which we can all guide our endeavours, and keep them all simultaneously working in the same direction. What, then, can be more reasonable than to begin our reformation by falling back upon the best period of our native and Christian art, and making that the nucleus around which our future style is to be moulded?

True it may be that it originated among "rude men," and "under very unfavourable circumstances;" but is not this the most amazing proof of its intrinsic merits? If a fine style of art had originated among men in the highest state of mental culture, and possessing every possible advantage, we might admire, but we could not wonder at it; but when the architectural works of such an age are rendered utterly contemptible and nauseous by comparison with those which are the invention of "rude men under very unfavourable circumstances," our admiration is converted into astonishment, and we can hardly account for it by attributing the merits of the works of the ruder period to anything much short of inspiration.

It is solely on account of this intrinsic merit, and this comparative suitableness to our wants, that we select Pointed architecture as the nucleus upon which we propose to construct the architecture of the future. Experience shows that we must have some common ground-work to go upon, and we hold that among all styles none can have such claims as that which was the spontaneous growth of our own soil, while it is at once suited to our climate and materials, our national associations and our religion.

To revive this style *entire* and *without addition* would, however, be the height of absurdity. It makes no such unreasonable claims upon us, nor do we make such claims for it. We only claim that it shall be our groundwork—our rallying point—by which our strivings after an architecture of our own may be kept together. We should each strive earnestly and boldly to adapt it to every new condition and requirement, and to every new material and invention which bears in any degree upon the architecture of our day. That is the *first* point; let details follow of themselves. There is no reason to alter them without an object, nor should we too servilely copy them. The mediæval architects did not copy the one from the other, though, working on the same principles, they, naturally, often arrived at the same results. We should work in the same way. In designing a number of Gothic windows it is impossible to avoid using many which have been used before, nor is it objectionable to do so. The simplest combinations must naturally often recur. Ideas will often be given by old examples which we happen to see, and it would be silly to reject them; but on the other hand, I would not *copy* them, but try to catch the spirit of the idea and reproduce it *literally*, with any variation of which it is capable,—making it, in fact, our own. As I said before, there is a period of comparative servility in learning any art. We are, as regards the revival of Pointed architecture, still in that stage; but our opponents must give us time: spur us on as much as they please, but do not ridicule nor discourage us.

One word on churches, and I have done. I agree with those who say that the adoption in our revival of any feature exclusively belonging to an obsolete or rejected rite is foolish and objectionable; but the theory that Pointed architecture is essentially Roman Catholic I must protest against. If so, why was it never adopted at Rome? and how was it, that it owed its extinction directly to Rome and to Papal influence? No: it is the Christian architecture of the Teutonic race. Romanism was an accident to which it had to adapt itself, as it will now have to adapt itself to our Reformed ritual; but it has nothing to do with its rise, or its essential character. The style, again, which we advocate is not one to which we are unaccustomed, or to which we have to tutor ourselves before we can fancy it. It is the architecture of, perhaps, ninety-nine hundredths of our parish churches, and no one whose happiness and privilege it has been faithfully to restore an ancient church, can have failed to be convinced of their perfect adaptation, or, at least, of their ready adaptability to every requirement of our own church.

If "J. F." would spend but a few months in humble and patient examination and study of our ancient churches, from the noble thought which planned the whole to their minutest detail, he would arrive at a very different set of opinions from those which he now holds, and his exertions might then be more successfully directed to reviving and re-adapting than they now are to pouring contempt on those who are labouring to do so: at least, he would not sully his pen by comparing even the rudest specimens of Christian art to the *carvings of New Zealanders*.

In what I have said as to churches, I, of course, speak only for the Church of England. We want no other architecture than that which we claim as our own. Let other communities judge for themselves.

GEORGE GILBERT SCOTT.

NEW CHURCH AT DEVONPORT.—The chief stone of St. Mary's Church, Morice-town, Devonport, was laid on Tuesday in last week. The building is to consist of a nave 72 feet long, 21 wide, and 36 high to ridge of roof; chancel, 32 feet long, 21 wide, and 36 high; north aisles, 74 feet long, 17 wide, and 33 high; south aisle, 48 feet long, 17 wide, and 33 high; north and south chancel aisles, for school children, each 22 feet long, 17 wide, and 33 high. There will be a tower at the west end 22 feet square at base, with spire rising to a height of 122 feet. The walls will be built of limestone and lined with brick, the dressings and moulded work being of Bath stone. The flooring will be of Stafford-ware tiles, black and red, and the roofing of Memel timber, stained and varnished within. The sittings will be open, and for about 800 persons. The style is Middle Pointed. Mr. J. P. St. Aubin is the architect, and Messrs. W. and T. May are the builders.

ROYAL INSTITUTE OF BRITISH ARCHITECTS.

AT an ordinary meeting on the 8th inst., Mr. Bellamy in the chair, Dr. Layard and a number of foreign architects, proposed as honorary members, were "hung up:" their names, however, will come more legitimately before us when they are elected. The donations included a new treatise, entitled "Acoustique et Optique des Salles Publiques," by Theodore Lacôte.

It was announced that the names of Messrs. B. H. Galland, A. J. Hiscocks, and R. C. Saunders, had been removed from the list of associates.

Mr. Edward Falkener, with reference to a recent conversation on the connection between Greek and Egyptian art, submitted a drawing of a capital at Karnak, Thebes, which closely resembled the Grecian Doric capital, having a square abacus, with large ovolo beneath, and four fillets. The column had twenty-eight flutes; the diameter of the column was 3 feet 4½ inches, and the abacus, 4 feet 9 inches square.

The Chairman said, it was certainly a stronger evidence than the column sketched by Mr. Barry, and given in a foot note in Gwilt's edition of Chambers.—Mr. Donaldson said, he must still adhere to the "hut theory:" he could not attach any importance to one or two casual exceptions from ordinary Egyptian work which appeared to have a resemblance to Greek.—Mr. Tite thought the example shown could not for a moment be considered as having formed a type.

Mr. S. Sinirke described briefly an arrangement which has been adopted to ventilate the rooms of the Institute, long needed. It consists of a fan worked by a weight, outside an opening in one of the windows, and which, irrespective of the state of the external atmosphere, is calculated to pump out all the air in the apartment in the space of a few minutes.

Mr. Britton then brought before the meeting a very interesting series of drawings of church towers and spires in different parts of England, made by Mr. C. Wickes, architect, of Leicester, introducing the subject with some earnest and excellent observations, on the rise and progress of the Institute, the position of architects, and the task they have before them.

Mr. Godwin followed with some remarks on the fertility of invention shown by the English mediæval architects in the towers and spires of parish churches, and which were themselves alone a sufficient disproof of the assertion recently hazarded in contempt of these structures. He referred to the miserable state of many fine towers,—St. Mary's, Taunton, one of the most beautiful of its class, was an instance,—and mentioned some examples recently before him (Dundry church tower, near Bristol,* and others), of the mischief done by the use of iron ties.

Mr. Tite, having first warmly welcomed Mr. Britton once more amongst them, expressed a hope that the views, if published, would be executed in outline. He referred to a very fine spire at Lillebonne, Normandy, and that at Harfleur, both the work of Englishmen. The most interesting tower in Paris, the *Tour de la Boucherie*, was going fast to decay.

Mr. Fowler suggested as an interesting subject for inquiry,—The causes which had led to the local peculiarities observable in church towers,—as in those of Devonshire and Somerset for example. As to the tower of St. Mary's, Taunton, he fully joined in the admiration and regret that had been expressed, and was satisfied that in that instance also the iron ties which had been introduced many years ago had proved very prejudicial.

A paper was then read by Mr. G. R. Burnell,—On the peculiar and distinctive character of the Gypsum (sulphate of lime) found near Paris, and its preparation and application as plaster in French buildings,—to which we shall return.

DOWNING-STREET.—Can you inform me what is to be done with the vacant piece of ground in Downing-street? Would not this be a good site for the Royal Academy to erect a building on, should they have to leave Trafalgar-square.—A BRICK.

* We shall speak of this next week.